

10-30-1950

Radio Script

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Radio Script" (1950). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 49.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/49

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

1950 J 28 I do not know all the answers to
the questions troubling you personally or our country
but I'm doing my very best to find them

My fellow Montanans:

This is Mike Mansfield speaking. I want to, at this time, thank the people of Montana for the consideration you have always shown to me over the years. I am grateful for your many kindnesses to me during this and previous campaigns. I have tried to see as many of you as I could so that I could become more aware of your problems -- so that I could have the benefit of your advice and counsel -- and so that I could be a better representative of the people of this State. My entire record⁺ and my personal background have been placed before you over the past eight years, because everything I have done has been above board and for all to see. My record, while not perfect, is good, and I am proud of it. *I have campaigned clearly; I will finish the same way!* My opponent in this campaign has been indulging in personalities for the past six months, uttering outrageous falsehoods and raising a few legitimate issues. I shall ^{try to} not indulge in personalities, but I will expose his lies and I will declare my position not only on the issues which he has raised but also on a number of others and ask him to tell the people of Montana what he stands for.

So far as I have been able to see, *he is against everything + in favor of nothing. He knows the cost of everything; the value of nothing.* the only thing he is in favor of is the Taft Hartley Act, and he is against everything else. It is very easy to become personal in a campaign if a candidate desires to be elected regardless of the ^{truth} cost and at any price. It is very easy to criticize but very difficult to offer ^{constructive} alternatives. Never once have I heard my opponent mention Montana, our people, or our ~~resources, our development.~~ Evidently the job means everything to him -- our State, our people, and ~~our future mean nothing.~~ He has been a demagogue as attested to ^{by} ~~by an~~ his

statement in Butte on Sept. 13, that

article appearing in the Great Falls Tribune of ~~September 14~~ ^{September} in which he is quoted as saying in Butte on ~~October 13~~ ^{September} that "Russian and Chinese soldiers slaughtering Americans in the streets of Butte and other Montana cities is a definite possibility", and claiming further, "Such an occurrence could develop from the Mansfield report on China." This to me is a most despicable statement, and for a congressional campaign in this district it hits a new low. ~~Does~~ ^{Does} he think that he ~~can~~ fool and frighten the decent, hard-working citizens of this district by making such an outrageous and demagogic statement? If he ~~does~~, I am afraid he has much to learn from the people he seeks to represent.

My opponent, according to the Missoulian of July 19, asked "Why Mansfield failed to defend American freedoms on the Mundt-Nixon Bill?" Surely he has gone over my record with a fine-toothed comb and knows that I voted for the Mundt-Nixon Bill two years ago and for the ~~McKare~~ ^{McCarren} Anti-Subversive Bill in September of this year. On July 15, according to the Great Falls Tribune, ~~he even accused me of~~ ^{in Butte last Friday} being "afraid of standing on my record." Of course I am standing on my record -- a record of eight years in behalf of the people of the State of Montana and my country -- a record which is down in black and white for everyone to see and for everyone to judge. It is a record that will stand the test of any scrutiny, and I commend it to my opponent for further study.

My opponent ~~seems to be~~ ^{says that} accusing the Mansfield report on China, submitted to the Congress and the President of the United States in January 1945, as being something which was ~~is~~ responsible for the outbreak

of the Korean war. He has used his debating technique to try to put thoughts into the minds of the people of Montana and words into my mouth which he ^{clear} could not substantiate from the report. He states, according to the speech which he made before the Republican State Convention last summer ~~and thousands of copies of which he has distributed throughout the State since~~, that I said that the communists in China were "agrarian reformers." He is entirely mistaken because what I said in the report ^{it was based on talks with Pat Hurley, Chennault, + Wedemeyer} was that the interests of the Chinese communists ^{+ in this I was supported} "seem to focus on agrarian reforms." It might interest the people of Montana to know, and I am sure it will come as a surprise to my opponent, that General Patrick Hurley, former ambassador to China and former Republican Secretary of War in the Hoover cabinet, stated in ~~his~~ speech before the Washington Press Club on November 29, 1945 -- long after my report on China was published -- "The only difference between Chinese communists and Oklahoma Republicans is that the Oklahoma Republicans are not armed." Furthermore, General Hurley also said, and I read from the record, ^{Feb. 1944} "Before the Yalta Conference, I suggested to President Roosevelt a plan to force the National Government, that is of China, to make more liberal political concessions in order to make possible a settlement with the communists. The President did not approve the suggestion." ^{Remember that is Pat Hurley, the Republican, not Mike Mansfield, the Democrat, speaking - saying speaking.} He also tries to make you believe that the warning I received from Sun Fo in ~~that~~ ^{my} Report about "an idealistic bond between Yen-an and Russia" was not passed on to the President or Congress. The warning was passed

on, not merely to the President and to Congress, but to the American people generally and even to ~~Mr. McCinnis himself~~. ^{my opponent because I sent him a copy of} If you will read ^{my} the ^{first} paragraph on the first page of his speech delivered to the ^{Report.} Montana State Republican Convention in Helena ^{last summer} on August 19, 1950, you will note that he states, "I first received a copy of the Mansfield report on China during the spring of 1945." ^{At that time I became} ~~amazed that Mike Mansfield, in his report to Congress, actually endorsed and praised the Chinese communists, even though he did not visit their territory in China.~~ Where else would he find out about the warning if not from that report? The warning, as part of the report, is in the Congressional Record for all to see. That report was sent to every newspaper in the State of Montana, but as far as I know, only one newspaper, the Great Falls Tribune, ^{carried it.} ~~I did not praise the Communists in my report but I did specifically uphold~~ Furthermore, and I am sure people listening in will find this of ^{Chung Kai-shek} ~~interest, I received a letter from my opponent, dated December 5, 1945,~~ from the Port Director's Office, Seattle, Washington, Thirteenth Naval District. ^{I hold it in my hand,} The last paragraph ^{reads as follows} -- and this is from my opponent: "Well, Mike, keep up your excellent work. I know ^{that} you have a good slant on things. And goodness knows, there is the greatest need for vision ^{into and} in any action on America's problems. ^{Sincerely yours, Lt. Ralph Y. McShin} You will note that in ^{USNR} his speech ^{last August} he stated that he received a copy of the Mansfield report on China in the spring of 1945. This portion of the letter which I have just read was dated December 5, 1945. Why did it take my opponent so long -- five years -- to tell the people about these charges of his? Why didn't he write to me and call them to my attention and demand an explanation? Why is he using such low-down, gutter-snipe tactics? ^{character assassination} ~~political ambition~~ ^{and mud slinging} the answer?

Does he think that by using the Hitler and Stalin technique of the big lie that he can hood-wink the people of Montana?

He also states that because of the Mansfield report President Truman in 1945 informed our faithful ally, Nationalist China, that unless the communists were admitted to the government, the United States would supply no further aid. In answer I want to state that my opponent has greater access to White House information than I have. The President at no time has informed me that my report was the basis for any of his actions on China. The distortion in this assertion becomes even more evident when it is realized that aid of one sort or another has continued almost without interruption since V-J Day and is indeed going forward

to Formosa today. *We have supported the Chinese Nationalists all the time. Why doesn't he tell you that I am one of those who have believed in this*
My opponent also states repeatedly that "five years ago Mansfield

implied that we had nothing to fear from China." There is no such implication anywhere in the report. On the contrary, for those who have eyes to read it honestly, ~~read it.~~ there is a clearcut warning of the danger of civil war in China, and, if it came, the possibility of "intervention of a great power in the Chinese internal situation."

That I am against recognition of Red China + against admitting her to the U.N.?

That is precisely what has happened because, as every grade school child knows, Russia is the power behind Communist China today.

He states also that "anyone reading the Bolton report would know we have plenty to fear from communism anywhere in the world." In answer I want to say that the Bolton report was published in 1948, three years after my mission to China. That report was the work of a sub-committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. I approved

Remember, too, the quotation I read a few moments ago wherein I showed - from the Record - that Republican Pat Hurley suggested a nationalist-communist coalition quit to Pres. Roosevelt + Roosevelt turned him down.

the issuance of the Bolton report, and I also voted for the publication of thousands of additional copies.

My opponent also states "at no time since World War II has he opposed the State Department policy of appeasing communist aggression." Well, ~~the debate coach is at it again.~~ When in doubt be indefinite. What appeasements? Where did they take place? Is aid to Greece and Turkey appeasement? Is voting for the Marshall Plan in Europe to stop communism appeasement? Is voting for the North Atlantic Pact and the Mutual Defense Assistance Act to arm our friends in western Europe appeasement? Is voting for a 70-group Air Force appeasement? Is fighting for a strong Marine Corps appeasement? *Is supporting the Berlin Air Lift appeasement?* Is voting for military aid to China, the Philippines, Iran, and Korea appeasement? Is voting for economic aid to Korea appeasement? By the way, my opponent has stated that "the blood of every American killed in our war against communism should cling to the conscience of my opponent, Mike Mansfield." This is so despicable a charge that it is contemptible. Why doesn't he tell you that the bill for aid to Korea was defeated by a vote of 192 to 191 in the House on January 19, 1950; and why doesn't he tell you that of the 192 who voted to kill the Korean aid bill, 130 were

folks listening in realize that this is the first campaign that the Republicans
Republicans who lined up with ~~Mark Antonio~~ *Marcantonio - the party lines -* of New York to kill it? *Do you*
Why doesn't he tell you that I led the fight for the same and that I voted to have the second bill, which passed, brought up? The Republicans led the fight against aid to Korea and called it "Operation *Rathole*" ~~Rat-O~~ *It*
~~was an easy bill to vote against, it was an easy bill to demagogue about,~~
~~but~~ *It* is a hard vote for the Republicans to explain today. When

-6-

opposition has not tried to link me with Marcantonio? Why? Because they are the ones who - except for a few of their party - have consistently gone down the foreign policy party line with him.

^{Voorhees}
Mr. Voorhees, Republican of Ohio, made the motion to kill the Korean aid bill, ^{he} said, on page 672 of the Congressional Record for January 19, 1950, "This is an easy bill to vote against. This is an easy bill to demagogue about. This is an easy bill to vote against because you can say you are doing it in the name of economy. But before you do so, you had better think of your responsibility as American citizens, and you had better think of the welfare and security of your own country. The ^{choice} ~~change~~ is pretty definite -- the decision is up to us." On page 1782 of the Congressional Record of February 9, 1950, when the Korean-Formosan aid bill finally passed, I had this to say in leading the fight for the bill: "The issue is clear. We ought to be satisfied that the time is at hand when we can stand up and be counted. We have a pledge to keep, and I hope on this floor today we are sure that we mean what we say by giving an overwhelming vote in favor of this measure."

~~Why doesn't he tell you that the majority of the Republicans are~~ ^{noted}
I have advocated and voted for every measure designed to check ^{against}
communist aggression and to provide us with allies. If my opponent ^{foreign}
only knew the fights we have had to get what little we get over strong ^{feeling}
Republican ^{isolationist} idealistic opposition, he would be aware of the fact, as I ^{meant}
am sure he is, that the lies fly back in his teeth. ^{as Al Smith would say,} Read the record and ^{in the Congress}
note how I stand on every measure. I am not a post-Korea preparedness
~~man because I have recognized the situation throughout the world as it~~
~~actually has existed.~~ My opponent even states that my report on China
helped to create the war in Korea today. This is a contemptible effort
to capitalize, for political purposes, on the anxiety of all Americans
over events in Korea and the risks to which our young men are being
subjected there. Korea is not mentioned once in my report of 1945.

There is, on the other hand, ample warning of the danger to the peace in the Far East if China did not set its house in order and thereby forestall imperialistic intervention by the Soviet Union.

He states further, "Ever since 1945 I doubted and questioned his inference that we had nothing to fear from communism in China." ~~Again the debate coach takes the stand.~~ Remember his letter to me of August 1945 complimenting me on my position.⁷ My opponent infers and implies what exists in his mind, and fortunately I am not responsible for that. The stated facts disprove his contention and show him up for what he really is. It is a strange kind of logic that interprets the clear warning of a dangerous situation as meaning there is nothing to fear. I wonder what my opponent would have had me report. Would he want me to lie or to tell the truth? Why does he attack me for telling the truth? Would he bear false witness to catch a vote? If he would, he is not fit for any office, ~~not even a teaching position,~~ let alone representing ^{me} ~~you~~ in the Congress of the United States.

You are entitled to know my full record as your representative, and you are entitled to know my background and my opponent's, too. ~~He has not told you what he stands for, nor has he mentioned his background. I do not know what he is for, but it appears from his press releases that he is against everything.~~ As far as our backgrounds are concerned, I do not need to tell you that I was raised in Great Falls, worked in the smelter there and in the mines in Butte, and that I served in the Navy during the first war at the age of 14 and later in the Army and Marine Corps as an enlisted man. You all know that and

also that I taught at our University for ten years before going to Congress. But what do you know of my opponent's background? Why doesn't he spell it out for you? ~~He came from Ohio to Montana in 1939, and excluding his war service as an officer in the Navy he has been in our State eight years.~~ What has he said in his campaign that indicates he is interested in us, our future, and the development of our State. Is he afraid to give credit where credit is due for Hungry Horse, Canyon Ferry, the Anaconda ^{lumber} ~~mines~~, the Libby Dam, the REA's, the new industries in the Butte-Anaconda and Hungry Horse areas, and all the other things we have all done, together, to build Montana? No, Montana and its people are not worth mentioning by this ~~carpetbagger~~. *opportunistic.*

Peace by him is only worth mentioning to the extent that he says
- *did you know he made a report, too? -*
in his report ^{that} "the United Nations could not prevent a third World War." I do not subscribe to his defeatist attitude about world peace because I will never let up in my efforts to achieve it. Neither do I subscribe to his defeatist attitude about the United Nations because it is Man's best and perhaps last ^{hope} ~~fight~~ for peace. I will fight to keep it going, to strengthen it, to participate in it, because I believe that the lives of our people are the most important resource we have. ~~In Butte, last Friday, he said again that the U.N. was as weak as we have.~~ Neither do I subscribe to his apathy. He has said nothing ^{it even} ~~about maintaining our security. What does he stand for in preparedness?~~ ^{was. He} ~~He hasn't said a word. Oh yes, he said I did not vote for preparedness measures before the Korean war, but he cannot prove it and the record will bear it out.~~ ^{stands} ~~against~~ ^{everything} ~~for~~ ^{nothing.}

~~As far as I can find out he stands for -~~ *this is a very general & non-specific platform, the following:*

1. River valley integration. But he says I do, too.
2. He stands for winning the war. Every American does.
3. To establish peace. And every American does, too.
4. He stands for defending our American freedoms forever.

What American doesn't.

But maybe his real platform is summed up in his fifth plank in which he says "Switch from Mike." That is something that neither he nor I can decide. That decision rests with the people of Montana, who will have to decide on November 7 whether I have performed my duties as their representative honestly, capably, and as they would want me to. I lay my eight years record -- and I am proud of it -- before the people to whom I am responsible; and I ask them, on the basis of my stewardship, not to switch from Mike, but to vote right, vote Mike.

My opponent ~~says I have ridden the fence on the CVA~~ and asks me what my stand is on ^{CVA +} Senate Bill 1645. It is all I can do to read as many of the 9500 House bills introduced in ^{the 81st this session} ~~this~~ Congress without having to go over to the Senate and reading ^{its} ~~their~~ bills, too. Consequently, I have not read Senate Bill 1645. I do want the people of Montana to know, though, ^{as I have told you repeatedly over the years} that I am not against a CVA or any other similar idea, because I think every measure should be considered on its merits, and I would welcome discussion on the House floor of the CVA bills introduced ^{in the Senate.} ~~by Senator Cain, Republican of Washington, or Senator Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, if they ever get out of that body.~~ ^{Furthermore, I have been} I feel that any ^{downing} measure which would bring about greater economy of operation, do away ^{my} with ^{duplication} ~~disruption~~ of services, decrease the number of bureaus, and bring ^{best} to get ^{both the proper House + Senate Committees to come to Montana to hold public meetings so the wishes of the people could become known + made crystal clear.}

about benefits for the people in the area concerned should be given very serious consideration. However, as I have stated repeatedly to the people of Montana, I would not be in favor of any kind of bill, C-V-A or otherwise. regardless of what it would do, if it meant another attack on the level of Flathead Lake; if it meant that Montana would not get first and major use out of the waters of our State; and if it would not mean added benefits, more jobs, and greater security to our people.

My opponent preaches economy, ^{rapes the Brauman Plan & comes out for what he calls} ~~he says he will reduce taxes, and pulls~~ leather on the bureaucrats. How does he propose to produce economies? ^{a sensible} How does he propose to reduce taxes? ^{para} And why should he, of all people, ^{program} find fault with bureaucrats? I wish my opponent would tell the people ^{What} of Montana if in his residence in the State of Montana he has ever worked ^{is} for private enterprise. I know that he has drawn his salary from either ^{it?} the State or the Federal Government during his entire residence in our ^{We would} State -- and in my book that makes him a bureaucrat. ^{likes to pass} ~~He'll probably~~ ^{judgment on} ~~come back and tell you that he has only actually lived in the State of~~ ^{it. Do} ~~Montana eight years and that for three years in addition he was an~~ ^{you want} ~~officer in the United States Navy.~~ ^{as to continue}

~~I hope that he doesn't expect to win on his war record alone,~~ ^{\$ 350,000,000} ~~because in that respect he and I both have war records. However,~~ ^{worth of food} ~~100,000 other men,~~ ^{including meat,} ~~in the State of Montana have just as good war records~~ ^{milk, eggs, &} ~~as his or mine, and most of them, I believe, are a great deal better.~~ ^{potatoes? This} ~~I deserve no credit for my war record. I am deeply grateful that I was~~ ^{food should} ~~privileged to serve my country. The men who really deserve credit for~~ ^{be made} ~~their war records are the men who never returned from war. I do not~~ ^{available to} ^{the people} ⁱⁿ ^{regular} ^{market} ^{channels} ^{at reasonable}

^{prices. That's} ^{what the Brauman} ^{Plan proposes to do -} ^{give the farmers & consumers} ^{a break - & take the food} ^{out of the canner.}

believe that any candidate for political office should ever presume on his record in the service of his country. I feel very humble in comparison with the men in all branches of the service who died and were never able to return, or who were injured and never able to resume a normal occupation. In comparison with them my contribution has been very small indeed.

My opponent says he is in favor of the Hoover reorganization plans. Is he completely in favor of them? I am, with one exception - that is the transferring of veterans hospitals & medical facilities away from the V.A. to some new Bureau.

He says he's against "socialism at home & Communism abroad." That sounds good & makes a fine slogan but what specific legislation passed by Congress does he consider socialistic? What socialistic laws now on the books would he repeal? Social Security? R.E.A.'s? Rural telephones? Veterans care & benefits? As far as being against Communism abroad is concerned ~~he~~ should blush with shame at the record of the majority of ~~your~~ ^{this} party because they joined with Marcantonio in obstructing, cutting down, & voting against every foreign policy bill we tried to enact ~~into~~ ^{into} law.

I wonder who's trying to make a sucker out of whom? Who has been giving life service to the battle against Communism & who's been in there pitching for measures designed to hit the Reds where it hurts?

Emphasize Hungry Horse

Emphasize we can prevent a third World War

Republicans on disarmament

Korean Aid Bill - (Vorys of Ohio made motion to recommit

Recommitted 192 to 191 - January 19, 1950)

P. 672 - January 19, 1950

Mansfield said, in fighting for the bill;

"This is an easy bill to vote against. This is an easy bill to demagog about. This is an easy bill to vote against because you can say you are doing it in the name of economy. But before you do so you had better think of your responsibilities as American citizens and you had better think of the welfare and security of your own country. The choice is pretty definite - the decision is up to us".

P. 1782 - February 9, 1950 - Korea Aid Bill passed 240 to 134 but Miller of Nebraska offered motion to recommit. - defeated 239 to 137.

Mansfield said, in fighting for bill;

"The issue is clear. We ought to be satisfied that the time is at hand when we can stand up and be counted.... We have a pledge to keep and I hope on this Floor today we will show that we mean what we say by giving an overwhelming vote in favor of this measure."

Companion

Radio Talk - Nov. 6, '50
8:45 P.M.

My Fellow Montanans:

This is Mike Mansfield speaking. May I at this time thank the people of Montana for their unfailing kindness to me during this and previous campaigns. I would like also to thank the press and radio for their unfailing courtesy toward me. I have been ~~very~~ busy in the little ^{under} ~~over~~ five weeks that I have been home seeing old friends, making new ones, listening to and trying to do something about your complaints and grievances, ^{answering letters,} carrying on the duties of my office and covering the seventeen Counties of Western Montana. ~~I have never had any illusions about the position I am again asking you to elect me to. It is a difficult one and decisions of vital importance will have to be made. I have accepted the responsibility that you have given me and I have cast my vote on each and every measure brought before the Congress on the basis of what I thought was right and not on the basis of expediency.~~ My job representing you takes my undivided attention all the time. There is no unimportant problem to anyone who seeks my assistance. If the problem you have is important to you, then it is important to me. It doesn't matter who you are, what you are, or where you come from - if you think enough of me to ask for help, I think enough of you to do all I can to help. ~~I am naturally proud of what we have been able to~~

accomplish for our State. You all know what those accomplishments are without my going into details. The key to the building up of Montana is the development of our water resources because we have in our State 10% of the hydroelectric potential in the entire United States. Canyon Ferry, Hungry Horse and Libby Dam mark only the beginning of the eventual 10,000,000 kilowatts of power which will be brought into being in the years ahead, which will build our state and give us a more diversified economy and a greater degree of security, ^{+ which will harm no one but} ~~I feel that we must~~ ^{will benefit everybody.} furnish every available opportunity and advancement to our people, especially our youngsters because the future of our State will soon be in their hands. We do not want other states to get the benefit of the training which our young people have received. We want our youngsters to stay in Montana so that the investment which we have in these trained people will come back to them and to us many times over. The parents of these youngsters also have an investment in Montana. They have helped us by building up our State. They have stayed with us when the going was tough. They have contributed mightily of their resources and we are indebted to them for their great contributions to our welfare. We know that our people would like to stay in Montana but we also know that we must give them every opportunity we possibly can.

Since my talk to you last Monday night I have been noting in the press that my opponent has continued to wage a campaign of detraction, distortion and destruction. My opponent has consistently ~~avoided the truth~~, exploited the fictitious and he has sought to put words in ^{to} my mouth and thoughts into your minds which are not true. He has tried ^{hard} ~~diligently~~ to create suspicion, uneasiness and confusion because he has made charges based upon deliberately untruthful statements. His reckoning is not with me but with the people of Western Montana whom he is ^{deliberately} ~~deliberately~~ trying to hoodwink. He has found fault, so far as I can see, with only two or three of my votes over the past eight years. During that period I have voted approximately 1600 times. ~~I am sure that on many of the votes I have cast he could honestly disagree with, but as he has not mentioned them I feel I may be given the benefit of the doubt and accorded a very satisfactory passing grade.~~ My record is down in black and white for all to see. It is a good record, an honest record and no one can falsify the facts and be honest with himself and the people he seeks to serve. The latest attempt of my opponent to confuse you is in the manner in which he has been glossing over the Korean Aid Bill. He states, according to the Montana Standard of November 3rd, that the

first Korean Aid Bill was passed in the fall of 1949 "with the aid of a Republican minority". How true - And where was I? Right in there fighting and voting for the Bill. Where was the Republican majority in the House? Why, in my opponent's own words of last Thursday, it was passed "with the aid of a Republican minority". Yes, the Republican majority with the active aid and assistance of Marc Antonio, the ^{Communist} party liner, fought and voted against this Bill as they did against every foreign policy measure in the 81st Congress. Do you folks listening ^{is} ~~not~~ realize that this is the first campaign that the Republican opposition has not tried to link me with Marc Antonio. Why? Because they are the ones who - except for enlightened minority of their party - have consistently gone down the foreign policy party line with him. Then in the same issue of the ~~Montana~~ Standard ^{my opponent} he has the gall to say that the administration "prevented all military aid to Korea except \$200.00 worth of signal wire". He knows that ~~that~~ is a falsehood. All he has to do, and I am sure he has already done so, is to see my answers to the so-called Fourteen Unanswered Questions which appear on Page A7509 of the Congressional Record for October 10th, 1950. There he will see in black and white that what we had sent to Korea prior to the outbreak of the difficulties there, totalled over \$57,000,000.00 worth of military equipment, including small arms, rifles, carbines,

ammunition, machine guns, mortars, howitzers, bazookas, and other ~~types~~ of hardware.

Now we come to the subject of "Socialized Medicine". Those of you who know what the Democratic State Platform contains will recall that one plank in that platform reads as follows:

"We are unalterably opposed to socialized medicine in any form". Two weeks ago last Friday night I returned a call from my family physician in Missoula. He asked me what my stand was on "socialized medicine". I told him that I was against it but that there were six bills, including one by Senator Taft, before Congressional Committees. He said they were all socialistic and he wanted a yes or no answer on my stand on these bills by the following Sunday. I told him that I could not give him a yes or no answer on bills I had not seen and which had not even been reported out of Committee. I added though that I had sent my views on these matters to every medical group and to every individual who had written me over the years and that the statements thus made would have to stand because I would not bow at any time, let alone two weeks before an election, to pressure, nor would I take a stand about something I did not completely understand and about which in its final form I could not possibly have any knowledge. This doctor had ~~had~~ breakfast with me in Washington some months ago. I

knew he wanted to talk about compulsory medicine then but after giving him all the leads I could he didn't even mention the subject. On Friday, two weeks ago, I invited him to breakfast again but due to a strenuous schedule he was unable to accept. The next I knew he had personally sent out a news release to every newspaper in Western Montana detailing in a very abbreviated form our telephone conversation. He told the papers to use the release as they saw fit. He also sent out personal letters to some of my doctor friends, perhaps to all doctors in Western Montana, who told me that in these letters he was requesting a contribution of \$50.00 "to defeat Mike Mansfield." I have the highest respect for this doctor and I do not question his integrity one bit. He will, unless he refuses us and I am sure he will not, continue to be our family doctor because we have every confidence in him. I do, however, question his judgment in this particular instance and I would like to ask him a question. Doctor, if a patient came to you and he suspected he had a cancer, could you, by just looking at him give him a yes or no answer? Or would you call for an examination and give him various tests before you made your final diagnosis and came up with your answer? Speaking as a layman, Doctor, I believe you would follow the latter course, would you not? And yet you are loath to credit me with sense enough to follow

a similar procedure in my study of a bill which I am duty bound to examine and apply various tests to before I can make my final diagnosis and arrive at a fair decision. Do you remember, Doctor, a letter you wrote me on March 11th, 1950, in which you said:

"I am, of course, aware of the fact that legislators are constantly bombarded by pressure groups, but to me a legislator has a greater responsibility than just voting with the majority. He should study both sides of a question and base his decision on whether or not a measure is to the best interest of this country and its people as a whole and not whether it is for the benefit of himself or any particular group of individuals".

Do you recall, Doctor, my answer to you of March 15th, 1950, wherein I said:

1
"You are right when you refer to the pressures which are constantly bombarding legislators. This trend is getting to be more terrific as time goes on and the only thing that surprises me is that the members are able to hold up as well as they do under the stress and strain of political life."

I wish that to all questions I could give a straight yes or no answer. However, that would brand me as a fool who does not study a problem and as one whose thinking is done for him. There are many questions I cannot answer, even after long study, until the time comes for a vote - and I have never yet failed to stand up and be counted at that time. Doctor, I want you and the people of Montana to know that I will not bow to pressure from any source - be it a person, an organization, or a corporation. When the people elected me to Congress they had faith in me and they trusted me to use my own best judgment. I have done my best to be worthy of my trust and I have tried to justify the faith reposed in me.

Let me, in concluding this part of my speech, join with my friend, Senator Hunt of Wyoming - a dentist of distinction and a man of integrity, who said in the Billings Gazette of April 26th, quoting from a speech made in Dallas, Texas, April 25th:

"Congress recognizes the problem of medical care for low-income families and we are waiting for and expecting a proposal from the medical profession."

Senator Hunt, like me, is opposed to "socialized medicine" and I concur fully in the statement just read. Do you?

In the last few days I have been receiving word from Kalispell that the rumors going around in the Flathead are that if the Democrats are elected - I suppose that means me - that Flathead Lake will be raised fifty feet. This is an outrageous falsehood because the people in the Flathead know the fight we had to save the Lake in 1943; know that the Hungry Horse is assurance^{+ assurance} that the Lake will not be tampered with again; know that I have stated repeatedly that I would never allow such a thing to happen under any circumstances. I have never lied to the people of Montana and when I give you an assurance you can depend on the fact that I am telling you the truth. ^{The land of} Flathead Lake will not be tampered with ^{again, I repeat,} ~~as long as I am in the Congress~~ of the United States. " " " " " "

My opponent has given much publicity to his war record but I have a war record too. There are 100,000 other Montanans with war records as good and in most instances better than his or mine. I deserve no credit for my war record but I am deeply grateful that I was privileged to serve my country. The men who really deserve credit for their war records are the men who never returned from war. I do not believe that any candidate for political office should ever presume upon his record of service to his country. I feel very humble in comparison with the

~~men in all branches of the service who died and were never able to return. In comparison with them my contributions have been very small indeed.~~

As the campaign draws to a close I want to say that the numerous falsehoods repeated by my opponent following the Hitler - Stalin technique of the big lie have been refuted and that every issue he has raised has been met. He has tried to make you believe that I did not vote for preparedness measures until after Korea. The answer of course lies in the record and the record will show that I not only voted for every preparedness measure but that I fought for them as well. The people of Montana, by the way, are still waiting to hear the answers to the questions I raised last Monday. Where does my opponent stand on the ^{many} domestic questions I asked? Where does he stand on the ^{many} foreign policy questions I asked? Where does he stand on Montana, its people and its development? ^{The people know where Mike Mansfield stands.} ~~These are very important questions and I believe the people are entitled to an answer. I wish my opponent would speak up, use less words, and state more facts and tell the people of Montana before it is too late just where he does stand on all these questions. I don't think he should try to fool them by double talk, ^{silence} ~~silence~~ or evasion, but I think he should come out like a man and a Montanan and tell us the truth.~~